

CONGRESS NOT GETTING ON.

SLOW WORK IN THE HOUSE.
THE HOUSES INTERFERED AND THE REPUBLICANS DISPOSED TO FILLISTER—FERNANDO WOOD LETS OUT A DELIGHTFUL SECRET—GENERAL NEWS.

Small progress was made in the House yesterday. The Republicans filibustered both on the bill about the removal of causes and the Silver bill, because the Democrats were obstinate as to accepting Republican suggestions. Mr. Wood stated in a committee meeting the other day that the election laws must be repealed or else the Democrats cannot carry New-York. The attempt to fix a day of adjournment has been abandoned. Nothing can now be predicted about adjournment. The Legislative bill will probably be sent to the President this week, and will be promptly vetoed.

WARNER AN UNLUCKY LEADER.
ANOTHER DAY OF WARFARE OVER THE SILVER BILL, WHICH AGAIN LEAVES THE SILVER PARTY DEFEATED—FILLISTERED BY THE REPUBLICANS.

WASHINGTON, May 21.—After another day spent in fighting under the leadership of General Warner, the Democrats and Greenbackers of the House find themselves in the same state of uncertainty and demoralization that they were in when the House adjourned yesterday.

When the Silver bill was taken up to-day the Democrats had already suffered a reverse, caused by a stupid attempt of Mr. Townsend, of Illinois, who has charge of the bill providing that causes shall not be removed from State to Federal Courts in certain cases, to rush that bill through under the operation of the previous question. Mr. Fry proposed that the bill should be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary where it properly belongs. This suggestion was curtly rejected as was also an appeal by Mr. Conger, that further opportunity be allowed for the discussion of the bill itself. The Republicans then to a man refused to vote. This course defeated the House of a quorum. On motion of Mr. Townsend a call of the House was ordered, and this with a roll call on the motion to suspend the call, consumed the morning hour. A leader of any sagacity would have foreseen this result, but Mr. Townsend is not such a leader.

The pending motion on the Warner bill, which was then taken up, was on the adoption of the fourth section containing the Marsh amendment. The motion was carried by a vote of 113 to 109, and the result was received with applause by the Republicans. Fourteen Democrats, among whom was Mr. Springer, of Illinois, voted in the affirmative, and one Republican, Mr. Daggett, of Nevada, in the negative. The motion to table a motion to reconsider this vote was adopted by 110 to 109. While the vote on the fourth section is not regarded as a sure test of the strength of the opponents of the bill, it indicates a fair prospect that the measure will be finally defeated.

The fifth section relating to the exchange of subsidiary coins was then adopted without a division. General Warner then admitted an amendment offered by Mr. Weaver, of Iowa, which requires and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay out any standard silver dollars that may be in the Treasury the same as gold coin in liquidation of all kinds of coin obligations of the United States without discrimination. This amendment was carried by a vote of 142 to 75. The section as amended was then adopted without a division.

When the eighth section was reached the previous question having been called, but not yet seconded, General Garfield moved to strike out the clauses which provide that silver certificates may be used to pay the interest on the public debt; that the amount of certificates issued shall not exceed 20 percent beyond the amount of coin and bullion in the Treasury; that they shall be receivable at par for all dues to the United States, including duties on imports; and that they may be computed as part of the lawful money reserve of the National banks. General Warner refused to raise a vote on this amendment. General Garfield raised the point of order that the section was in contravention of Section 4, Article 14, of the Constitution of the United States, which declares that the validity of the public debt shall not be questioned. He stigmatized the proposition as not only naked repudiation, but a flat violation of the Constitution.

The Speaker promptly overruled the point of order. One or two other points of order made by the Republicans were also overruled; and it became evident that the only course left to pursue in order to secure the privilege of offering amendments and of discussion was to filibuster.

General Garfield gave fair warning that the House would again find itself without a quorum on the next vote.

Mr. Mills, of Texas, appealed to Mr. Warner to allow an opportunity for discussion, saying that it was useless to try to coerce a minority as long as the Democrats had not a quorum of the House present.

Several Democrats said they would not yield; and Mr. S. Cox gave notice that on Monday next he would offer a resolution to compel the minority to vote. Amidst the derisive laughter of the Republicans, he was asked how he proposed to compel members to vote. He replied that he would cut off their per diem.

The remainder of the afternoon was consumed by a yeas and nays vote on a motion to lay the eighth section on the table, which was defeated by 102 to 82, by a call of the House, and by voting on motions to adjourn.

The advocates of the Warner bill are in a quandary. Not one of them is satisfied with all of its provisions and they are all afraid of it and of each other. General Warner, who has charge of the bill, is very earnest, but as he is an extremely nervous, fidgety person, he is anxious to lead himself and his party by securing an adjournment to allow him time to collect his scattered faculties. As a parliamentary leader he is one of the worst failures in the House, and that is saying a great deal.

Representative Atkins, of Tennessee, in conversation this evening expressed the utmost confidence that the Silver bill will pass the House by six or seven majority. He says that if the Democrats can hold out the measure in both Houses, they might as well give up trying to do anything. He is of the opinion that if the hard-money Democrats hold out in their opposition to the bill, they ought to be considered and treated hereafter as not belonging to that party. While he thinks it possible that the Democrats will be a long one, General Atkins says the Democrats will sit the bill out and pass it if it takes a week.

MR. WOOD BETRAYS A SECRET.
RE SAYS THE DEMOCRATS CAN ONLY EXPECT TO CARRY NEW-YORK BY REPEALING THE ELECTION LAWS—INTERESTING COLLOQUIES IN COMMITTEE.

WASHINGTON, May 21.—A week ago Mr. Fernando Wood introduced in the House a resolution which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means for adjournment on the day of May.

When the committee had the measure under consideration on Tuesday of last week, Mr. Wood was in favor of fixing upon a day for adjournment in the latter part of the month, regardless of the appropriation bills. A Republican member of the committee held that the appropriation bills should be passed before adjournment.

favor of the plan adopted by the Democrats of placing the political sections in the appropriation bills, but he held that since the position had been taken there was nothing for the Democratic party to do except to insist that the political features of the appropriation bills should stand or fall with the other portions.

The Republican members of the committee, seeing a disposition on the part of one or two Democratic members to take a conservative course, suggested that a resolution be reported that Congress adjourn without day on the second day after both appropriation bills had received the approval of the President.

The Democrats said that this was altogether too indefinite.

Mr. Wood then made a rather remarkable statement. He said it was utterly useless to expect that Congress and the President would come to any understanding in regard to the pending legislative issues, and that the President would not sign any bill that Congress would pass, while the majority in Congress was equally determined not to be content with any measure which would meet the President's views. In substance he said there was no chance of a compromise, and the only thing left was to fix upon a time for adjournment and stick to it.

Some Republicans made objection to this, and expressed the hope that the situation was less serious than the chairman believed.

In reply to this Mr. Wood said that no proposition which could be made that did not involve the repeal or the modification of the election laws could possibly be entertained by the Democrats. He said this matter was one of vital importance to the Democratic party. It could never hope to carry New-York, he said, as long as the election laws stood unimpaired, and it was out of the question to expect that the Democrats in Congress would assent to any other plan than the one they have already initiated.

A Republican member of the committee expressed surprise at such an expression of opinion from Mr. Wood, and reminded him that these election laws had been on the statute books for seven or eight years, and that, notwithstanding this fact, the Democrats had in 1876 carried the State of New-York by a considerable majority, and there was no reason why a majority of the vote, if actually cast for the Democrats, should not carry it again.

Mr. Wood said that he had been indiscreet, and said in reply that Mr. Davenport had not then brought the machinery for carrying elections to such a state of perfection as he has since done, within the last two years. He said that Davenport had perfected this machinery, and the consequence was as he had stated it.

Further consideration of the measure was postponed until this week. At the meeting yesterday for the consideration of the measure it was postponed indefinitely. This is interpreted to mean that the majority of the Ways and Means Committee is not yet prepared to support a measure looking to the adjournment of Congress without passing the appropriation bills, otherwise it would have assented to Mr. Wood's proposition fixing upon some day of the present month for final adjournment.

The length of the extra session of Congress is therefore a matter upon which it is not safe to risk a positive opinion. Several Democrats of influence have intimated to leading Republicans that they are personally willing to pass the appropriation bills without any political riders, and that they are in the issue of the Government and the revenue only economy, and a reduction in the salaries and number of officials. The platform also declares that the Government is being run at a loss of \$10,000,000 a year, and demands a strict account from public servants and the punishment of offenders.

A JUMP FROM NIAGARA BRIDGE.
NIAGARA FALLS, N. Y., May 21.—At 3 o'clock this afternoon Steve Pierre, of Drummondville, Ont., walked on one of the brace wires from the Canada side to the centre of the new suspension bridge and back again, performing as a gymnast on the wire. At 4 o'clock Mr. H. J. Poirer, of Toronto, Ont., jumped from the centre of the bridge into Niagara River, 190 feet below. He had a wire attached to a cylinder and floated to a point where he was picked up by a launch. He was uninjured, but his clothes were in shreds, which kept him upright. The descent was made in four seconds. Men in a boat picked him up. He came up all right. About one thousand people witnessed the feat. He will probably jump again in July.

PITTSBURG, PORT WATNE AND CHICAGO.
PITTSBURG, Penn., May 21.—The annual meeting of the stockholders of the Pittsburgh, Port Wayne and Chicago Railroad was held here to-day. The report of the President, Mr. J. H. Poirer, showed a net income of \$7,800,190, an increase over the preceding year of \$201,253. The net earnings for 1878 were \$3,609,196. The following were the directors: J. H. Poirer, President; J. A. Scott, of Philadelphia; John Sherman, of Ohio; and L. R. Harrison, of Cincinnati.

A MAN WHO SURVIVED A HANGING.
CINCINNATI, May 21.—William Allen, alias Storey, of St. Louis, eloped with Jennie Atchley, the wife of a farmer, of Batavia, Ohio, a few days ago. He was captured in this city and placed in jail at Batavia. This morning he was taken to the gallows, where he was hanged. He was a man of about 30 years of age, and was dressed in a suit of blue cloth. He was hanged by a rope around his neck, and his body was left to swing in the breeze. He was hanged at 10 o'clock.

THE LEGISLATIVE BILL.
GENERAL ATKINS SAYS THAT IT IS TO BE REPORTED TO-MORROW—THE PRESIDENT TO VETO IT.
[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]
WASHINGTON, May 21.—General Atkins, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, said this evening that the Legislative Appropriation bill, which was referred to his committee to-day, with the Senate amendments, will be reported to the House to-morrow, with a recommendation that the amendments shall not be concurred in. The bill will then probably go to a Committee of Conference. It is not expected that the struggle will be a long one. It is thought that the House will finally agree to the amendments of the Senate. These amendments relate to the pay of Senate employees, which the House has been vainly trying for several years to fix at the same rate as those of the House employees. The bill will probably go to the President next Saturday.

A general press dispatch says that there is good authority for stating that the President will veto the Legislative bill as passed by the Senate, and if it reaches him on Friday or Saturday the veto message will be sent to the House of Representatives on Monday next. The Attorney-General has already furnished the President with his objections to the sections concerning the supervisors and deputy marshals, which especially relate to his department. It is expected that the message will be brief. It will be the duty of supervision is necessary to ensure free elections.

A LAND OFFICE CASE.
AN ACT DRAWN UP TO RELIEVE CERTAIN SETTLERS IN KANSAS.

WASHINGTON, May 21.—By the Act of June 23, 1878, provision was made for the disposal of the lands of the Kansas trust reserve, to actual settlers according to an appraisement previously made, and orders were issued by the Interior department to carry this law into effect. The appraisement having been complained of as fixing too high a value upon the lands, the Act of July 5, 1879, empowered the Secretary of the Interior to order a reappraisement after first obtaining the consent of the Indians. This was done, and the lands were again appraised by Commissioners during the year 1878, and the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, approving the same, has just been laid before the Interior Department and approved by the Secretary. It is now ascertained that quite a large portion of the lands, some of which had been actually entered and partly paid for under the Act of 1874, cannot be brought under the Act of 1879, on account of the unavoidable delay in procuring the Indian assent to its terms as well as by the failure of Congress to refer the matter to the Department for information as to whether any settlers had entered under the Act of 1874, whereby a false record was made in the law which had the effect of depriving such settlers of the benefit of the reappraisement. The Secretary has therefore submitted to Congress the draft of a bill covering these meritorious cases, and directed the Commissioner of the General Land Office to dispose of the residue of the lands as provided in the Act of 1874, and to dispose of amounts to 216,738 acres of land, which are situated in Morris and Lyon Counties, Kansas.

WASHINGTON NOTES.
WASHINGTON, Wednesday, May 21, 1879.

The subscriptions to the four per cent refunding certificates since yesterday's report have amounted to \$1,187,370.

Mr. Hill, Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department, will be restored to duty as soon as official notice of the result of his trial in Chicago is received.

The \$13,120,000 of refunding certificates yet to be delivered, which at the present rate, will be done within seven days. The entire issue will be \$40,000,000 and no more.

Justice Hunt is rapidly improving in health. He is able to use the assistance of a cane and servant. He is now residing at his home in Utica, N. Y. He will leave here this evening for his home in Utica, N. Y.

The House Committee on Customs and Finance has this morning instructed Chairman Stephens to

report to the House revised edition of the report of the XLIVth Congress relative to the metric system of weights and measures which was prepared by C. P. Culver, the clerk of the committee; the idea being to ask for the introduction of the metric system into the United States from foreign countries. The International Metric Bureau of Paris alone has made application for 1,500 copies.

The following have been appointed as the Board of Visitors to attend the annual examination of cadets at the Naval Academy in June next: Commodore Thomas H. Stevens, United States Navy; Chief Engineer Jas. W. King, United States Navy; the Rev. Ebenezer Bushnell, Fremont, Ohio; General Jas. L. Wilson, New-York City; General Eli H. Murray, Louisville, Ky.; Colonel Wm. H. Russell, Providence, R. I.; and Captain John M. Brooke, Lexington, Va. The above were designated by the President. The following members were designated by the Speaker of the House: Chairman Freeman, Pennsylvania; M. I. Durham, Kentucky; and Robert M. Knapp, Illinois. R. B. Anthony and J. R. P. Smith are appointed members of the board by the President pro tem, of the Senate.

THE IOWA DEMOCRACY.
A SOFT-MONEY TICKET NOMINATED.

THE STATE CONVENTION NEARLY WRECKED ON THE FUSION QUESTION—PROBABLY A UNION WITH THE GREENBACK MEN.

COUNCIL BLUFFS, Iowa, May 21.—Sixty-nine of the 100 counties in the State were represented in the Democratic Convention to-day, and there were 470 delegates present out of the 600 provided for in the call. General A. C. Dodge was Chairman of the Convention, and T. A. Walker the Secretary. On taking up the question of fusion with the Greenback party, General Dodge denounced the Republican party for forcing the resumption of specie payment, and urged the union of all the elements opposed to the Republican party. Judge H. H. Trimble was nominated for Governor by acclamation.

When the voting for Lieutenant-Governor took place, the convention came near being wrecked upon the question of fusion with the Greenback men. Moses Bloom, who was nominated for Lieutenant-Governor, declined, and Colonel J. S. Tam and D. P. Stubbs, a Greenback man, were named. Mr. Stubbs receiving 244 and Colonel Tam 191 votes. The fact that Mr. Stubbs had a majority was discovered by the opponents of fusion before the vote was announced, and they resorted to every device to change the result. It being questioned whether the convention should nominate any but Democrats for State officers, the convention was adjourned until to-morrow. Captain J. O. Youman was then nominated by acclamation. Peace was thus restored, and the ticket, which is, on the whole, a soft-money ticket, was completed. A fusion with the Greenback party will probably take place, as Judge H. H. Trimble, who has accepted the nomination for Governor, has nominated for Supreme Court Justice, and Irvin Baker for Superintendent of Public Instruction.

It is declared that liberty depends upon the strict construction and observance of the Constitution and all its amendments; that the people have a right to know the truth, and that the Government is not to be deceived by the schemes of the enemies of the Republic. The platform also declares that the Government is being run at a loss of \$10,000,000 a year, and demands a strict account from public servants and the punishment of offenders.

The platform also declares that the Government is being run at a loss of \$10,000,000 a year, and demands a strict account from public servants and the punishment of offenders.

A JUMP FROM NIAGARA BRIDGE.
NIAGARA FALLS, N. Y., May 21.—At 3 o'clock this afternoon Steve Pierre, of Drummondville, Ont., walked on one of the brace wires from the Canada side to the centre of the new suspension bridge and back again, performing as a gymnast on the wire. At 4 o'clock Mr. H. J. Poirer, of Toronto, Ont., jumped from the centre of the bridge into Niagara River, 190 feet below. He had a wire attached to a cylinder and floated to a point where he was picked up by a launch. He was uninjured, but his clothes were in shreds, which kept him upright. The descent was made in four seconds. Men in a boat picked him up. He came up all right. About one thousand people witnessed the feat. He will probably jump again in July.

PITTSBURG, PORT WATNE AND CHICAGO.
PITTSBURG, Penn., May 21.—The annual meeting of the stockholders of the Pittsburgh, Port Wayne and Chicago Railroad was held here to-day. The report of the President, Mr. J. H. Poirer, showed a net income of \$7,800,190, an increase over the preceding year of \$201,253. The net earnings for 1878 were \$3,609,196. The following were the directors: J. H. Poirer, President; J. A. Scott, of Philadelphia; John Sherman, of Ohio; and L. R. Harrison, of Cincinnati.

A MAN WHO SURVIVED A HANGING.
CINCINNATI, May 21.—William Allen, alias Storey, of St. Louis, eloped with Jennie Atchley, the wife of a farmer, of Batavia, Ohio, a few days ago. He was captured in this city and placed in jail at Batavia. This morning he was taken to the gallows, where he was hanged. He was a man of about 30 years of age, and was dressed in a suit of blue cloth. He was hanged by a rope around his neck, and his body was left to swing in the breeze. He was hanged at 10 o'clock.

THE LEGISLATIVE BILL.
GENERAL ATKINS SAYS THAT IT IS TO BE REPORTED TO-MORROW—THE PRESIDENT TO VETO IT.
[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]
WASHINGTON, May 21.—General Atkins, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, said this evening that the Legislative Appropriation bill, which was referred to his committee to-day, with the Senate amendments, will be reported to the House to-morrow, with a recommendation that the amendments shall not be concurred in. The bill will then probably go to a Committee of Conference. It is not expected that the struggle will be a long one. It is thought that the House will finally agree to the amendments of the Senate. These amendments relate to the pay of Senate employees, which the House has been vainly trying for several years to fix at the same rate as those of the House employees. The bill will probably go to the President next Saturday.

A general press dispatch says that there is good authority for stating that the President will veto the Legislative bill as passed by the Senate, and if it reaches him on Friday or Saturday the veto message will be sent to the House of Representatives on Monday next. The Attorney-General has already furnished the President with his objections to the sections concerning the supervisors and deputy marshals, which especially relate to his department. It is expected that the message will be brief. It will be the duty of supervision is necessary to ensure free elections.

A LAND OFFICE CASE.
AN ACT DRAWN UP TO RELIEVE CERTAIN SETTLERS IN KANSAS.

WASHINGTON, May 21.—By the Act of June 23, 1878, provision was made for the disposal of the lands of the Kansas trust reserve, to actual settlers according to an appraisement previously made, and orders were issued by the Interior department to carry this law into effect. The appraisement having been complained of as fixing too high a value upon the lands, the Act of July 5, 1879, empowered the Secretary of the Interior to order a reappraisement after first obtaining the consent of the Indians. This was done, and the lands were again appraised by Commissioners during the year 1878, and the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, approving the same, has just been laid before the Interior Department and approved by the Secretary. It is now ascertained that quite a large portion of the lands, some of which had been actually entered and partly paid for under the Act of 1874, cannot be brought under the Act of 1879, on account of the unavoidable delay in procuring the Indian assent to its terms as well as by the failure of Congress to refer the matter to the Department for information as to whether any settlers had entered under the Act of 1874, whereby a false record was made in the law which had the effect of depriving such settlers of the benefit of the reappraisement. The Secretary has therefore submitted to Congress the draft of a bill covering these meritorious cases, and directed the Commissioner of the General Land Office to dispose of the residue of the lands as provided in the Act of 1874, and to dispose of amounts to 216,738 acres of land, which are situated in Morris and Lyon Counties, Kansas.

WASHINGTON NOTES.
WASHINGTON, Wednesday, May 21, 1879.

The subscriptions to the four per cent refunding certificates since yesterday's report have amounted to \$1,187,370.

Mr. Hill, Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department, will be restored to duty as soon as official notice of the result of his trial in Chicago is received.

The \$13,120,000 of refunding certificates yet to be delivered, which at the present rate, will be done within seven days. The entire issue will be \$40,000,000 and no more.

Justice Hunt is rapidly improving in health. He is able to use the assistance of a cane and servant. He is now residing at his home in Utica, N. Y. He will leave here this evening for his home in Utica, N. Y.

The House Committee on Customs and Finance has this morning instructed Chairman Stephens to

report to the House revised edition of the report of the XLIVth Congress relative to the metric system of weights and measures which was prepared by C. P. Culver, the clerk of the committee; the idea being to ask for the introduction of the metric system into the United States from foreign countries. The International Metric Bureau of Paris alone has made application for 1,500 copies.

The following have been appointed as the Board of Visitors to attend the annual examination of cadets at the Naval Academy in June next: Commodore Thomas H. Stevens, United States Navy; Chief Engineer Jas. W. King, United States Navy; the Rev. Ebenezer Bushnell, Fremont, Ohio; General Jas. L. Wilson, New-York City; General Eli H. Murray, Louisville, Ky.; Colonel Wm. H. Russell, Providence, R. I.; and Captain John M. Brooke, Lexington, Va. The above were designated by the President. The following members were designated by the Speaker of the House: Chairman Freeman, Pennsylvania; M. I. Durham, Kentucky; and Robert M. Knapp, Illinois. R. B. Anthony and J. R. P. Smith are appointed members of the board by the President pro tem, of the Senate.

THE IOWA DEMOCRACY.
A SOFT-MONEY TICKET NOMINATED.

THE STATE CONVENTION NEARLY WRECKED ON THE FUSION QUESTION—PROBABLY A UNION WITH THE GREENBACK MEN.

COUNCIL BLUFFS, Iowa, May 21.—Sixty-nine of the 100 counties in the State were represented in the Democratic Convention to-day, and there were 470 delegates present out of the 600 provided for in the call. General A. C. Dodge was Chairman of the Convention, and T. A. Walker the Secretary. On taking up the question of fusion with the Greenback party, General Dodge denounced the Republican party for forcing the resumption of specie payment, and urged the union of all the elements opposed to the Republican party. Judge H. H. Trimble was nominated for Governor by acclamation.

When the voting for Lieutenant-Governor took place, the convention came near being wrecked upon the question of fusion with the Greenback men. Moses Bloom, who was nominated for Lieutenant-Governor, declined, and Colonel J. S. Tam and D. P. Stubbs, a Greenback man, were named. Mr. Stubbs receiving 244 and Colonel Tam 191 votes. The fact that Mr. Stubbs had a majority was discovered by the opponents of fusion before the vote was announced, and they resorted to every device to change the result. It being questioned whether the convention should nominate any but Democrats for State officers, the convention was adjourned until to-morrow. Captain J. O. Youman was then nominated by acclamation. Peace was thus restored, and the ticket, which is, on the whole, a soft-money ticket, was completed. A fusion with the Greenback party will probably take place, as Judge H. H. Trimble, who has accepted the nomination for Governor, has nominated for Supreme Court Justice, and Irvin Baker for Superintendent of Public Instruction.

ART DISPLAYS IN LONDON.

NEARLY TWO THOUSAND PICTURES ON VIEW THE EXHIBITIONS OF THE ROYAL ACADEMY AND GROSVENOR GALLERIES OPENED—THE CRITIC'S TASK—FRENCH AND ENGLISH CRITICISM—MR. MILLAIS'S PORTRAITS.

LONDON, May 21.—The one hundred and eleventh Exhibition of the Royal Academy was opened to the public on Monday. The third (or it may be the fourth) exhibition of the Grosvenor Gallery was opened on the previous Thursday. More than 300 works of art are collected in the Grosvenor; nearly 1,000 are to be seen in the Academy. Here, truly, is matter to occupy the art-loving public for the rest of the season. The student has, or ought to have, more than enough to look at between now and the last of next August. The critic, on the other hand—the critic who writes on art for the London papers—is expected to judge this mass of work off-hand, and to print his matured opinions within two or three days. He does print a good part of them on the morning of the first day. It is not enough that the public should have pictures to gaze upon. It must be taught in advance what to think—what is worth looking at, and what may be safely passed by what pictures will be discussed at dinner-parties during the week, and what pictures will never be mentioned. The critic does his work with such energy and speed that he becomes himself one of the most interesting features of the Exhibition season. Of late years he has a day set apart for him. He has not only been permitted to visit the studios in advance, and often to describe what he has seen there, but there has been established in his honor and for his benefit a "press view," both at the Academy and the Grosvenor. This is fixed a day or two days in advance of the private view, properly so-called; a view which is so far private that the rooms are, if possible, more thronged on that day than on any other. The critic may, and does go, on private-view day also, and add to his stock of information by such casual glimpses of the bigger canvases as he may get between the benches and hats of his neighbors. Altogether, he has some six or eight hours in which to consider the 1,600 works of art in the Academy—say about fifteen seconds to each if he treats them with absolute impartiality. This done, he pronounces his decision first on the Exhibition as a whole; generally in the shape of a remark that it is better, or worse, as the case may be, than the average, or than last year's. He then deals with a considerable number of the pictures in detail. And I am bound to say that whatever be his disadvantages, he does in some cases display great accuracy of knowledge and genuine critical power.

It would be rash to say that the English critic is always the equal of his French comrade. Art criticism in France is, and has long been, one of the most delightful branches of a delightful literature. But then the French have, as a race, a natural love of art, and intuitive perceptions, which the English have not. Here, knowledge of art or real interest in art are the exception; in France they are the rule. To take but one very striking example, the late Chief of the Executive Power in France, M. Thiers, understood art almost as well as he did politics. It would be impossible to conceive of M. Thiers making such a speech about art as Lord Beaconsfield made the other day at the Academy dinner. Lord Beaconsfield may or may not have a natural aptitude for art. But he is a man of sufficient power of mind to have mastered long since its literature and its commonplaces, had he chosen to, or had he thought it worth while. The ignorance which he displayed is wilful ignorance; an ignorance which implied an equal contempt for art and for his audience. He is bantered a little about it, in the papers, but it really does him no harm. In France, a public man in high office could not afford to make such a parade of his incompetence. It would affect his whole political career. Along the whole scale of English and French life one is forced to remark a similar difference. You cannot be long in any company of Frenchmen without hearing something said about some form of art. It will be said intelligently, and dismissed by the whole company with interest, and the discussion will always be carried on with distinct reference to principles, to laws, and to historical examples. Whereas in England, outside of artistic circles, conversation will very seldom turn on art, except when an exhibition has lately opened, or a great picture sale is going on at Christie's. In some such favorable conjuncture of circumstances, you may hear remarks on the subject; which unhappily will prove in too many cases of a purely encephalic or purely commercial character. In any case, they will be brief. Society will tolerate no topic that cannot be disposed of in five minutes.

No wonder, then, that the English critic occasionally contents himself with a kind of treatment which his French brother would think inadequate and superficial, and which sometimes degenerates into mere flattery or mere abuse. He gives the public as good as the public wants—what more could he ask? The wonder is that the public taste does not rapidly grow more exact under the influence of three or four brilliant and learned writers who form the exception to the rule. Mr. Ruskin's health no longer permits him to deal with the pictures of his own signature. But, to name only men who write over their own signature, there are Mr. Sidney Colvin, Mr. Conyns Carr, and W. M. Rossetti. Perhaps Mr. Conyns Carr may be thought to be too exclusively the exponent of a particular school, but Mr. Carr and Mr. Colvin are open to no such reproach. Mr. Hamerton is a fourth writer whose accomplishments and critical power are also held in respect on the Continent. All of these men have been writing on art for years. They might not care to have it said that they took up the mantle which Mr. Ruskin laid down when he entered upon those social and economical subjects where he has wasted so much power. They have wrought each on his own line, with separate arms, and not without success. It remains true that it was Mr. Ruskin who first in this generation imparted to the British mind a fresh interest in art, and that, in a similar sense, the critics whom I have named are his successors. And it remains true that much of their preaching is still done in the wilderness.

An odd instance of the diversity of view prevailing among men who have no ground in common on which to stand, occurs with reference to two portraits exhibited this year in the Academy by Mr. Millais. They are portraits of two ladies; one Mrs. Arthur Kennard, well known to the world of London, and another so much less known that she modestly preserves an incognito, and her portrait figures in the catalogue anonymously as the "portrait of a lady." These are well-known critic praises as "painted with such freedom, so much that is magical in color, tone, and illumination, that Velasquez himself might own the pictures." Of the same pictures Mr. Conyns Carr says that they are "truly said to be," that they are "careless and incomplete," and that "if there were any grounds for the belief that Mr. Millais's powers had passed their prime, it would be almost painful to allude to such examples of his art." Now, it is not to be expected nor wished that two critics should always come to the same opinion about the same pictures. But this is not a radical difference of method, of principle, or of belief as to what goes to the making of a good picture, of what art is and what it is not, and an even more radical difference as to how it ought to be judged. Yet they both agree in admiring the same painter's portrait of Mr. Gladstone, while a third writer dissent from both and picks out the Gladstone portrait as an example of Mr. Millais's decadence of an artist who is in the prime of his great powers—as one of those failures which the best masters sometimes stumble into.

It is not to be expected nor wished that two critics should always come to the same opinion about the same pictures. But this is not a radical difference of method, of principle, or of belief as to what goes to the making of a good picture, of what art is and what it is not, and an even more radical difference as to how it ought to be judged. Yet they both agree in admiring the same painter's portrait of Mr. Gladstone, while a third writer dissent from both and picks out the Gladstone portrait as an example of Mr. Millais's decadence of an artist who is in the prime of his great powers—as one of those failures which the best masters sometimes stumble into.

It is not to be expected nor wished that two critics should always come to the same opinion about the same pictures. But this is not a radical difference of method, of principle, or of belief as to what goes to the making of a good picture, of what art is and what it is not, and an even more radical difference as to how it ought to be judged. Yet they both agree in admiring the same painter's portrait of Mr. Gladstone, while a third writer dissent from both and picks out the Gladstone portrait as an example of Mr. Millais's decadence of an artist who is in the prime of his great powers—as one of those failures which the best masters sometimes stumble into.

It is not to be expected nor wished that two critics should always come to the same opinion about the same pictures. But this is not a radical difference of method, of principle, or of belief as to what goes to the making of a good picture, of what art is and what it is not, and an even more radical difference as to how it ought to be judged. Yet they both agree in admiring the same painter's portrait of Mr. Gladstone, while a third writer dissent from both and picks out the Gladstone portrait as an example of Mr. Millais's decadence of an artist who is in the prime of his great powers—as one of those failures which the best masters sometimes stumble into.

It is not to be expected nor wished that two critics should always come to the same opinion about the same pictures. But this is not a radical difference of method, of principle, or of belief as to what goes to the making of a good picture, of what art is and what it is not, and an even more radical difference as to how it ought to be judged. Yet they both agree in admiring the same painter's portrait of Mr. Gladstone, while a third writer dissent from both and picks out the Gladstone portrait as an example of Mr. Millais's decadence of an artist who is in the prime of his great powers—as one of those failures which the best masters sometimes stumble into.

It is not to be expected nor wished that two critics should always come to the same opinion about the same pictures. But this is not a radical difference of method, of principle, or of belief as to what goes to the making of a good picture, of what art is and what it is not, and an even more radical difference as to how it ought to be judged. Yet they both agree in admiring the same painter's portrait of Mr. Gladstone, while a third writer dissent from both and picks out the Gladstone portrait as an example of Mr. Millais's decadence of an artist who is in the prime of his great powers—as one of those failures which the best masters sometimes stumble into.

It is not to be expected nor wished that two critics should always come to the same opinion about the same pictures. But this is not a radical difference of method, of principle, or of belief as to what goes to the making of a good picture, of what art is and what it is not, and an even more radical difference as to how it ought to be judged. Yet they both agree in admiring the same painter's portrait of Mr. Gladstone, while a third writer dissent from both and picks out the Gladstone portrait as an example of Mr. Millais's decadence of an artist who is in the prime of his great powers—as one of those failures which the best masters sometimes stumble into.

It is not to be expected nor wished that two critics should always come to the same opinion about the same pictures. But this is not a radical difference of method, of principle, or of belief as to what goes to the making of a good picture, of what art is and what it is not, and an even more radical difference as to how it ought to be judged. Yet they both agree in admiring the same painter's portrait of Mr. Gladstone, while a third writer dissent from both and picks out the Gladstone portrait as an example of Mr. Millais's decadence of an artist who is in the prime of his great powers—as one of those failures which the best masters sometimes stumble into.

It is not to be expected nor wished that two critics should always come to the same opinion about the same pictures. But this is not a radical difference of method, of principle, or of belief as to what goes to the making of a good picture, of what art is and what it is